RIKEN-QHP-202,
RIKEN-STAMP-17

# Complex saddle points and the sign problem in complex Langevin simulation

Tomoya Hayata[a], Yoshimasa Hidaka[b], Yuya Tanizaki[c,b]

[a]*RIKEN Center for Emergent Matter Science (CEMS), Wako, Saitama 351-0198, Japan*
[b]*Theoretical Research Division, Nishina Center, RIKEN, Wako, Saitama 351-0198, Japan*
[c]*Department of Physics, The University of Tokyo, 7-3-1 Hongo, Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo 113-0033, Japan*

arXiv:1511.02437v2 [hep-lat] 18 Nov 2015

**Abstract**

We show that complex Langevin simulation converges to a wrong result, by relating it to the Lefschetz-thimble path integral, when the path-integral weight has different phases among dominant complex saddle points. Equilibrium solution of the complex Langevin equation forms local distributions around complex saddle points. Its ensemble average approximately becomes a direct sum of the average in each local distribution, where relative phases among them are dropped. We propose that by taking these phases into account through reweighting, we can solve the wrong convergence problem. However, this prescription may lead to a recurrence of the sign problem in the complex Langevin method for quantum many-body systems.

## 1. Introduction

Precise analysis of thermodynamic properties of a quantum many-body system, in particular, precise determination of its phase diagram is one of great challenges in theoretical physics. An *ab initio* simulation based on lattice field theory, in particular, so called Monte Carlo simulation is the most powerful tool for this. In many interesting cases, however, Monte Carlo simulation is hindered by the notorious sign problem. The importance sampling, using the Boltzmann weight $\mathrm{e}^{-S}$, breaks down when the action becomes complex. In hadron physics, lattice quantum chromodynamics (QCD) simulation suffers from the sign problem at finite quark densities [1, 2], which is important to study quark matter inside neutron stars [3, 4]. The sign problem occurs also in condensed matter systems [5, 6, 7]. Important examples are the fermionic Hubbard model away from half-filling, and geometric frustration in spin systems. A method to overcome the sign problem attracts a broad interest for application to the aforedescribed quantum many-body systems.

There have been a lot of attempts to tackle the sign problem. Among them, idea of complexification of the integration variables is one promising way to solve the sign problem. Theoretical attempts along this line are classified into two approaches, that is, the Lefschetz-thimble and the complex Langevin methods. The Picard–Lefschetz theory gives a generalization of the steepest descent method, and Lefschetz thimbles are steepest descent paths in the extended complex plane [8, 9, 10]. This method is formulated on rigorous mathematics, but it needs some approximation when applied to quantum many-body systems [11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16]. On the other hand, the complex Langevin method is an extension of the Langevin equation to a complex Boltzmann weight [17, 18, 19, 20]. The numerical implementation of this is possible based on lattice field theory. The complex Langevin method has been widely applied from condensed matter to hadron physics [21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26]. However, this method is known to give wrong results for some cases, but the reason of the failure has not been fully understood yet. For recent discussions, see [27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35].

In this Letter, we show that complex Langevin simulation converges to a wrong result, when path-integral weight at complex saddle points has different phases. This includes the case of the breakdown due to a singular drift term, e.g., the lattice QCD at finite density. We reveal that complex Langevin simulation breaks down more generic case where the Langevin drift term has no singular point. With the help of semiclassical analysis, we find that reweighting by the complex phase can partially solve the wrong convergence problem. However, the reweighting leads, in general, to a severe cancellation of the reweighting factor in many-body systems, which is nothing but a sign problem in terms of the complex Langevin method.

## 2. Complex Langevin method and its failure

For simplicity, we discuss an oscillatory integral of one variable $x$, which can be extended to multiple integrals in a straightforward way,

$$\langle O(x)\rangle = \frac{1}{Z}\int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathrm{d}x\, \mathrm{e}^{-S(x)/\hbar} O(x). \tag{1}$$

where $Z$ is the normalization factor. The action $S(x)$ is complex valued in general, which makes the Monte Carlo simulation of Eq. (1) difficult because of the sign problem. One proposal to calculate Eq. (1) for a complex valued action is the so-called complex Langevin method [18, 19, 20]. In this method, we solve the Langevin equations for complex values $z = x + iy$ along the fictitious time direction $\theta$,

$$\partial_\theta z_\eta(\theta) = -S'(z_\eta(\theta)) + \sqrt{\hbar}\,\eta(\theta), \tag{2}$$

where $\eta(\theta)$ is real Gaussian noises satisfying $\langle\eta(\theta)\rangle_\eta = 0$, and $\langle\eta(\theta)\eta(\theta')\rangle_\eta = 2\delta(\theta-\theta')$. Since the action $S(x)$ is complex, the right-hand side of Eq. (2) is also complex. Thus, complexification of the variable $z$ is unavoidable, which is the reason why this method is called the complex Langevin method. In the real Langevin method i.e., if $S(x)$ is real, the ensemble average $\langle O(x_\eta(\theta))\rangle_\eta$ can be shown to converge to Eq. (1) as $\theta\to\infty$. There is a folklore theorem stating that the complex Langevin method also converges to Eq. (1) for the complex action $S(x)$. We first show that it is true only for very restricted cases. After that, we propose a new prescription to evade this breakdown.

Ito calculus shows the following: If the expectation value of a holomorphic operator $\widetilde{O}(z_\eta(\theta))$ converges as $\theta\to\infty$, the derivative of $\widetilde{O}(z_\eta(\theta))$, $O(z_\eta(\theta)) = \widetilde{O}'(z_\eta(\theta))$, must satisfy the Dyson–Schwinger (DS) equation,

$$\langle O(z_\eta)S'(z_\eta)\rangle_\eta = \hbar\langle O'(z_\eta)\rangle_\eta. \tag{3}$$

Here the argument $\theta=\infty$ of $z$ is omitted. When $\hbar = 0$, the DS equation can be solved by complex saddle points $S'(z_\sigma) = 0$ ($\sigma\in\Sigma$). Even at finite $\hbar$, the contour integral on the steepest descent path $\mathcal{J}_\sigma$ around each $z_\sigma$ solves the DS equation [36, 37, 38],

$$\int_{\mathcal{J}_\sigma} \mathrm{d}z\, \mathrm{e}^{-S(z)/\hbar}O(z)S'(z_\eta) = \int_{\mathcal{J}_\sigma} \mathrm{d}z\, \mathrm{e}^{-S(z)/\hbar}\hbar O'(z). \tag{4}$$

The Lefschetz-thimble method [9, 10, 39] is useful to connect those steepest descent integrals with the original one (1). Ensemble average of a holomorphic operator $O(z_\eta)$ at $\theta\to\infty$ can be, in general, represented as

$$\langle O(z_\eta)\rangle_\eta = \frac{1}{Z}\sum_{\sigma\in\Sigma} d_\sigma \int_{\mathcal{J}_\sigma} \mathrm{d}z\, \mathrm{e}^{-S(z)/\hbar}O(z). \tag{5}$$

Here, $d_\sigma$ is a complex number. If and only if $d_\sigma$ is an intersection number $\langle\mathcal{K}_\sigma,\mathbb{R}\rangle$ between a steepest ascent path $\mathcal{K}_\sigma$ and the original contour $\mathbb{R}$, the original integral (1) is recovered.

We analyze Eq. (5) in the semiclassical limit $\hbar\to+0$. For this, we expand $S(z)$ around each complex saddle point $z_\sigma$ as

$$S(z_\sigma+\delta z) = S_\sigma + \frac{\omega_\sigma}{2}\delta z^2 + O(\delta z^3). \tag{6}$$

Let us first analyze the left hand side of (5). If $\mathrm{Re}\,\omega_\sigma > 0$, the solution of the equation of motion (2) can converge into $z_\sigma$ as $\theta\to\infty$ in $\hbar\to 0$. On the other hand, it cannot converge for $\mathrm{Re}\,\omega_\sigma\le 0$. Then in the semiclassical approximation, we have

$$\langle O(z_\eta)\rangle_\eta \simeq \sum_\sigma c_\sigma O(z_\sigma), \tag{7}$$

where $c_\sigma\ge 0$, and $c_\sigma = 0$ if $\mathrm{Re}\,\omega_\sigma\le 0$. Next let us analyze the right hand side of (5). In the semiclassical approximation, the integral along the thimble becomes

$$\int_{\mathcal{J}_\sigma} \mathrm{d}z\, \mathrm{e}^{-S(z)}O(z) \simeq \sqrt{\frac{2\pi\hbar}{\omega_\sigma}}\mathrm{e}^{-S_\sigma/\hbar}O(z_\sigma). \tag{8}$$

Now, from the comparison of the both sides, we reach

$$c_\sigma = \frac{1}{Z}\sqrt{\frac{2\pi\hbar}{\omega_\sigma}}\mathrm{e}^{-S_\sigma/\hbar}d_\sigma. \tag{9}$$

Note that $c_\sigma\ge 0$. However, $d_\sigma$ needs to be an integer $\langle\mathcal{K}_\sigma,\mathbb{R}\rangle$ to recover (1). These two statements contradict with one another in general. If so, complex Langevin method cannot reproduce the original integral (1).

Equation (9) is completely sure for dominant saddle points. The above contradiction must be taken into account if the dominant saddle points have different complex phases. In other words, complex Langevin method may fail if there is some relative phase between the dominant saddle points. For subdominant saddle points, the ambiguity of Borel resummation of large order perturbations can give nontrivial cancellations [40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47]. This subtlety needs further studies.

Let us give a few comments on previous studies. There is a formal proof [27, 29] on the correctness of the complex Langevin method, but it relies on several nontrivial assumptions[1]. A recent study [34] elucidates that this assumption is questionable if some singularities exist in the complex action $S(x)$. Our analysis suggests that the breakdown happens in more generic cases, where the dominant complex saddle points have different phases.

## 3. Prescription

Let us propose a prescription to circumvent this inconsistency. We denote the equilibrium distribution of the complex Langevin method by $P$. The expectation value is given as

$$\langle O(z_\eta)\rangle_\eta = \int \mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}y\, P(x,y)O(x+\mathrm{i}y). \tag{10}$$

In the semiclassical limit, $P$ will be represented, by using a sum of distributions $P_\sigma$ localized at complex saddle points $z_\sigma$, as $P = \sum_\sigma P_\sigma$, which gives the expectation value (7) i.e,

$$\int \mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}y\, P_\sigma(x,y)O(x+\mathrm{i}y) \simeq c_\sigma O(z_\sigma). \tag{11}$$

By defining (nonholomorphic) functions $\chi_\sigma$ satisfying $\chi_\sigma P_\tau \simeq \delta_{\sigma\tau}P_\tau$, we define a phase function $\Theta$ by

$$\Theta(z,\bar z) := \frac{1}{Z}\sum_\sigma \frac{1}{c_\sigma}\langle\mathcal{K}_\sigma,\mathbb{R}\rangle\sqrt{\frac{2\pi\hbar}{\omega_\sigma}}\mathrm{e}^{-S_\sigma/\hbar}\chi_\sigma(z,\bar z). \tag{12}$$

If $P_\sigma$ does not overlap with others, $\chi_\sigma$ can be chosen as the characteristic function of $\mathrm{supp}(P_\sigma)$. This is not true in general, and we must find $\chi_\sigma$ satisfying the condition with a good approximation. The expectation value of a holomorphic operator $O(z)$ is given, by reweighting with $\Theta$, as

$$\langle\Theta(z_\eta,\bar z_\eta)O(z_\eta)\rangle_\eta/\langle\Theta(z_\eta,\bar z_\eta)\rangle_\eta. \tag{13}$$

[1] One of the most nontrivial assumptions would be the $C_0$ semigroup property generated by Fokker–Planck-type partial differential operators.

Even when the random noise or equivalently $\hbar$ correction is included, so long as $P$ is well localized around each saddle point, this prescription seems to work nicely. Note that this replacement does not break DS equations (3) so far as the semiclassical analysis is valid.

Now our question is "What $d_\sigma$, or $c_\sigma$, is adopted in the complex Langevin method?" If $\mathrm{Re}\,\omega_\sigma \le 0$ means $\langle \mathcal{K}_\sigma, \mathbb{R}\rangle = 0$, the following $d_\sigma$ is consistent with $c_\sigma \ge 0$:

$$d_\sigma = \sqrt{\frac{\omega_\sigma}{|\omega_\sigma|}}\, e^{i\,\mathrm{Im}S_\sigma/\hbar}\langle \mathcal{K}_\sigma, \mathbb{R}\rangle. \tag{14}$$

If this is true, the complex Langevin method gives an extension of the so-called phase quenched approximation to include complex saddle points:

$$\langle O(z)\rangle_\eta \simeq \frac{1}{Z}\sum_\sigma \langle \mathcal{K}_\sigma, \mathbb{R}\rangle \sqrt{\frac{2\pi\hbar}{|\omega_\sigma|}}\, e^{-\mathrm{Re}\,S_\sigma/\hbar} O(z_\sigma). \tag{15}$$

We adopt it as a working hypothesis in the following sections, although this is not the unique solution for consistency. Using this hypothesis, the phase function $\Theta$ is given by

$$\Theta(z,\bar{z}) := \frac{1}{Z}\sum_\sigma \sqrt{\frac{|\omega_\sigma|}{\omega_\sigma}}\, e^{-i\,\mathrm{Im}S_\sigma/\hbar}\chi_\sigma(z,\bar{z}), \tag{16}$$

and the reweighting formula (13) is available for practical use[2].

## 4. Numerical simulation

We test our proposal by applying it to two models with and without a singular drift term. We numerically solved (2) with the fictitious time step $\varepsilon = 5.0\times10^{-6}$ and $5.0\times10^{-7}$ for the models with and without the singular drift term, respectively. We adopted a higher order algorithm [49]. Errors were estimated by using the jackknife method. Below we set $\hbar = 1$.

### 4.1. One-site fermion model

First, as a nontrivial example with a singular drift term, we analyze a one-site fermion model. This is the simplest model to suffer from the sign problem same as that in lattice QCD simulations [50, 51, 52, 53]. To demonstrate that the modified complex Langevin method can simulate the Silver Blaze like feature [54] in the one-site model is a good landmark to show its applicability to the sign problem in many-body systems.

After introducing a Hubbard–Stratonovich field $\varphi$, we explicitly integrate out the original fermionic fields. The partition function reads [50]

$$Z = \int d\varphi_{\mathrm{bg}}\; e^{-S(\varphi_{\mathrm{bg}})}, \tag{17}$$

[2] A similar improvement of complex Langevin method by reweighting with saddle-point phases has been discussed in Ref. [48].




Figure 1: Fermion number $n$ as a function of chemical potential $\mu$ at $\beta U = 30$ with and without reweighting.

with the action,

$$S(\varphi_{\mathrm{bg}}) = \frac{\beta}{2U}\varphi_{\mathrm{bg}}^2 - 2\ln\left(1 + e^{\beta(i\varphi_{\mathrm{bg}}+\mu+U/2)}\right), \tag{18}$$

where $\varphi_{\mathrm{bg}} = \int_0^\beta d\tau\varphi(\tau)/\beta$ is the zero Matsubara mode of $\varphi$. $U(>0)$, $\mu$, and $\beta = 1/T$ are the on-site repulsive interaction, chemical potential, and inverse temperature, respectively. We dropped nonzero Matsubara modes of $\varphi$, since they do not couple to $\mu$ [50]. The auxiliary field $\varphi_{\mathrm{bg}}$ is related to the fermion number density $n$ by

$$n = -\langle \partial S/\partial(\beta\mu)\rangle = \mathrm{Im}\left[\langle\varphi_{\mathrm{bg}}\rangle/U\right]. \tag{19}$$

The integral (17) is analytically calculable, but instead, we shall apply the complex Langevin method. Due to the logarithmic term, the action has infinitely many saddle points, which appear in the period of $2\pi T$. Since the Lefschetz-thimble method is valid even with these logarithmic singularities [55, 56], all the discussions in previous sections are available in order to conclude the failure of the complex Langevin method. In the large $\beta U$ limit, complex phases of saddle points are flipped by $2\pi(\mu/U + 1/2)$ [50]. Thus, the complex Langevin simulation fails except for special points.

We show the fermion number $n$ as a function of the chemical potential $\mu$ in Fig. 1. The satndard complex Langevin method predicts the wrong linear $\mu$-dependence. This wrong behavior is also obtained from the mean field or the one-thimble approximation [50]. To find a reweighting factor, we use approximate expressions on the saddle points in the leading order of the large $\beta U$ expansion [50]. The residual sign coming from $\omega_\sigma$ turns out to be negligible for $\beta U = 30$. Then $\Theta$ reads

$$\Theta = \sum_{m\in\mathbb{Z}} e^{-2\pi i(\mu/U+1/2)m}\,\theta(2m-1 < \beta\,\mathrm{Re}\,z/\pi < 2m+1), \tag{20}$$

where $\theta(x)$ is the step function. We also show the fermion number after reweighting in Fig. 1. The result becomes much better, but we may still need an improvement of $\Theta$ for exact agreement.

We show the average phase factor $\langle\Theta\rangle_\eta$ as a function of the




Figure 2: Average phase function $\langle\Theta(z_\eta,\bar{z}_\eta)\rangle_\eta$ as a function of chemical potential $\mu$ at $\beta U = 30$.




Figure 3: Partially integrated distribution $P_y$ and its moment $y^5P_y$ at $\alpha = 1.4$.




Figure 4: Expectation value of iz as a function of $\alpha$, with and without reweighting.

chemical potential $\mu$ in Fig. 2. It becomes small near jumping points of $n$ at $\mu/U = 0$ and 1, and is getting close to one near the half filling $\mu/U = 1/2$. If we apply the conventional reweighting by the Monte Carlo method to the original integral (17), however, the severe sign problem appears for every $\mu/U > -1/2$ [50]. The cancellation of the phase function in the modified complex Langevin method is milder than that in the reweighting by the Monte Carlo method. The same cancellation may happen near phase transition points in many-body systems. If $\langle\Theta\rangle_\eta$ becomes exponentially small as the system size increases, it is also true that the sign problem is still obstinate in the complex Langevin method.

### 4.2. *Double-well potential model*

Next, we consider a model without a singular drift term, whose action is given by

$$S(x) = x^4/4 - x^2/2 - \mathrm{i}\alpha x, \tag{21}$$

with $\alpha > 0$. This action has three saddle points on the complex plane. Only two of them have positive $\mathrm{Re}\,\omega_\sigma$, and contribute to the semiclassical analysis. These two saddle points ($z_1$ and $z_2$) are, respectively, located on the first and second quadrant planes ($\mathrm{Re}\,z_1 > 0$ and $\mathrm{Re}\,z_2 < 0$). They have different complex phases, except when $\alpha = 0$. The complex Langevin simulation may fail at finite $\alpha$ from our semiclassical analysis given in Sec. 2.

The distribution of this model seems to have the power law behavior. We show the partially integrated distribution

$$P_y(y) = \int \mathrm{d}x\, P(x,y) \Big/ \int \mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}y\, P(x,y), \tag{22}$$

and its fifth moment $y^5P_y$ in Fig. 3. The distribution may behave as $P_y \sim y^{-5}$ at $y \to \infty$. The power law implies that the expectation value of a higher power of $z$, e.g., $z^n$ ($n \geq 4$) diverges[3]. Thus the complex Langevin simulation apparently breaks down, as expected. Remark here that since $z^n$ ($n \geq 1$) does not satisfy the DS equation (3) if the power law exponent is true, our argument based on the DS equation in Sec. 2 is no longer available. Nevertheless the complex Langevin method actually breaks down, and our prescription works well for lower dimensional operators as is seen in the following.

We show the expectation values of iz and $(\mathrm{i}z)^2$ as a function of $\alpha$ in Figs. 4 and 5. The complex Langevin simulation converges to a wrong result (red squares.) Based on our prescription, we put $\chi_1(z,\bar{z}) = \theta(\mathrm{Re}\,z)$ and $\chi_2(z,\bar{z}) = \theta(-\mathrm{Re}\,z)$. The result of the reweighting is also shown in Figs. 4 and 5 with blue circles. The reweighting works perfectly, and we resolve the wrong convergence problem. This is also true for $(\mathrm{i}z)^3$. For a diverging higher power of $z$, $(\mathrm{i}z)^n$ ($n \geq 4$), our prescription does not work, and the expectation values suffer from the large

[3] Recently, it is mathematically shown that the power law is always true for any polynomial model if we use the complex noise instead of the real one [57]. For the real noise, it seems to depend on a model whether the distribution shows the power law.




Figure 5: Expectation value of $(iz)^2$ as a function of $\alpha$, with and without reweighting.

fluctuations before and after reweighting.

## 5. Concluding remarks

We have analytically shown that complex Langevin method gives wrong results, when there are several dominant saddle points with different complex phases. Since the interference of these complex phases is an essential ingredient to understand the Silver Blaze phenomenon [50], the usual complex Langevin method would not be reliable in order to tackle the cold and dense nuclear matters. Moreover, this interference is also of great importance in order to study the dynamical phenomena, such as a particle production, using the real-time path integral [58, 59, 60].

The next problem is to modify the distribution so as to reproduce the expectation values in the original theory. We proposed a reweighting prescription by introducing a working hypothesis, which is consistent with the semiclassical analysis. This must be justified or revised in future study. Also the correct treatment of subdominant saddle points must be clarified. Our prescription is numerically confirmed for two models with and without singular drift terms. In particular, we succeeded to simulate the nonanalytic behavior of the one-site fermion model at low temperatures.

If our prescription were proven or revised, the modified complex Langevin method could provide a way to perform numerical simulations on multiple Lefschetz thimbles. However, it requires us to get complete knowledge on complex saddle points to assign correct phase function. Furthermore, our prescription causes a large cancellation of relative phases among saddle points, although it is somewhat milder than that of the conventional reweighting by the Monte Carlo method. This implies the sign problem possibly occurs in the modified complex Langevin method. To find more efficient prescription must be an important future study.

## Acknowledgments

T.H. thanks A. Yamamoto for stimulating discussions. Y.T. is supported by Grants-in-Aid for the fellowship of Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS) (No.25-6615). Y.H. is partially supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grants Numbers 15H03652. This work was partially supported by the RIKEN interdisciplinary Theoretical Science (iTHES) project, and by the Program for Leading Graduate Schools of Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, and Technology (MEXT), Japan.

## References

[1] S. Muroya, A. Nakamura, C. Nonaka, and T. Takaishi, "Lattice QCD at finite density: An Introductory review," *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **110** (2003) 615–668, arXiv:hep-lat/0306031 [hep-lat].
[2] G. Aarts, "Complex Langevin dynamics and other approaches at finite chemical potential," *PoS* **LATTICE2012** (2012) 017, arXiv:1302.3028 [hep-lat].
[3] M. G. Alford, A. Schmitt, K. Rajagopal, and T. Schäfer, "Color superconductivity in dense quark matter," *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **80** (2008) 1455–1515.
[4] K. Fukushima and T. Hatsuda, "The phase diagram of dense QCD," *Rep. Prog. Phys.* **74** (2011) 014001, arXiv:1005.4814 [hep-ph].
[5] E. Dagotto, "Correlated electrons in high-temperature superconductors," *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **66** (1994) 763–840.
[6] A. W. Sandvik, "Computational studies of quantum spin systems," *AIP Conference Proceedings* **1297** no. 1, (2010) 135–338. http://scitation.aip.org/content/aip/proceeding/aipcp/10.1063/1.3518900.
[7] L. Pollet, "Recent developments in quantum Monte Carlo simulations with applications for cold gases," *Rep. Prog. Phys.* **75** (2012) 094501, arXiv:1206.0781 [cond-mat.quant-gas].
[8] F. Pham, "Vanishing homologies and the *n* variable saddlepoint method," in *Proc. Symp. Pure Math*, vol. 40.2, pp. 319–333. AMS, 1983.
[9] E. Witten, "Analytic Continuation Of Chern-Simons Theory," in *Chern-Simons Gauge Theory: 20 Years After*, vol. 50, pp. 347–446. AMS/IP Stud. Adv. Math., 2010. arXiv:1001.2933 [hep-th].
[10] E. Witten, "A New Look At The Path Integral Of Quantum Mechanics," arXiv:1009.6032 [hep-th].
[11] **AuroraScience** Collaboration, M. Cristoforetti, F. Di Renzo, and L. Scorzato, "New approach to the sign problem in quantum field theories: High density QCD on a Lefschetz thimble," *Phys. Rev. D* **86** (2012) 074506, arXiv:1205.3996 [hep-lat].
[12] A. Mukherjee and M. Cristoforetti, "Lefschetz thimble Monte Carlo for many body theories: application to the repulsive Hubbard model away from half filling," *Phys. Rev. B* **90** (2014) 035134, arXiv:1403.5680 [cond-mat.str-el].
[13] G. Aarts, "Lefschetz thimbles and stochastic quantisation: Complex actions in the complex plane," *Phys. Rev. D* **88** (2013) 094501, arXiv:1308.4811 [hep-lat].
[14] H. Fujii, D. Honda, M. Kato, Y. Kikukawa, S. Komatsu, and T. Sano, "Hybrid Monte Carlo on Lefschetz thimbles - A study of the residual sign problem," *JHEP* **1310** (2013) 147, arXiv:1309.4371 [hep-lat].
[15] F. Di Renzo and G. Eruzzi, "Thimble regularization at work: from toy models to chiral random matrix theories," *Phys. Rev. D* **92** (2015) 085030, arXiv:1507.03858 [hep-lat].
[16] K. Fukushima and Y. Tanizaki, "Hamilton dynamics for the Lefschetz thimble integration akin to the complex Langevin method," arXiv:1507.07351 [hep-th].
[17] G. Parisi and Y.-s. Wu, "Perturbation Theory Without Gauge Fixing," *Sci.Sin.* **24** (1981) 483.
[18] J. R. Klauder, "Coherent-state langevin equations for canonical quantum systems with applications to the quantized hall effect," *Phys. Rev. A* **29** (1984) 2036–2047.
[19] G. Parisi, "On complex probabilities," *Phys. Lett. B* **131** (1983) 393–395.
[20] P. H. Damgaard and H. Huffel, "Stochastic Quantization," *Phys. Rep.* **152** (1987) 227.

[21] F. Karsch and H. W. Wyld, "Complex Langevin Simulation of the SU(3) Spin Model With Nonzero Chemical Potential," *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **55** (1985) 2242.

[22] J. Ambjorn, M. Flensburg, and C. Peterson, "The Complex Langevin Equation and Monte Carlo Simulations of Actions With Static Charges," *Nucl.Phys.* **B275** (1986) 375.

[23] G. Aarts and I.-O. Stamatescu, "Stochastic quantization at finite chemical potential," *JHEP* **09** (2008) 018, arXiv:0807.1597 [hep-lat].

[24] G. Aarts, "Can stochastic quantization evade the sign problem? The relativistic Bose gas at finite chemical potential," *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **102** (2009) 131601, arXiv:0810.2089 [hep-lat].

[25] D. Sexty, "Simulating full QCD at nonzero density using the complex Langevin equation," *Phys. Lett.* **B729** (2014) 108–111, arXiv:1307.7748 [hep-lat].

[26] T. Hayata and A. Yamamoto, "Complex Langevin simulation of quantum vortex nucleation in the Bose-Einstein condensate," arXiv:1411.5195 [cond-mat.quant-gas].

[27] G. Aarts, E. Seiler, and I.-O. Stamatescu, "The Complex Langevin method: When can it be trusted?," *Phys. Rev. D* **81** (2010) 054508, arXiv:0912.3360 [hep-lat].

[28] G. Aarts and F. A. James, "On the convergence of complex Langevin dynamics: The Three-dimensional XY model at finite chemical potential," *JHEP* **08** (2010) 020, arXiv:1005.3468 [hep-lat].

[29] G. Aarts, F. A. James, E. Seiler, and I.-O. Stamatescu, "Complex Langevin: Etiology and Diagnostics of its Main Problem," *Eur. Phys. J. C* **71** (2011) 1756, arXiv:1101.3270 [hep-lat].

[30] J. M. Pawlowski and C. Zielinski, "Thirring model at finite density in 0+1 dimensions with stochastic quantization: Crosscheck with an exact solution," *Phys. Rev. D* **87** (2013) 094503, arXiv:1302.1622 [hep-lat].

[31] G. Aarts, P. Giudice, and E. Seiler, "Localised distributions and criteria for correctness in complex Langevin dynamics," *Ann. Phys.* **337** (2013) 238–260, arXiv:1306.3075 [hep-lat].

[32] A. Mollgaard and K. Splittorff, "Complex Langevin Dynamics for chiral Random Matrix Theory," *Phys. Rev. D* **88** (2013) 116007, arXiv:1309.4335 [hep-lat].

[33] G. Aarts, L. Bongiovanni, E. Seiler, and D. Sexty, "Some remarks on Lefschetz thimbles and complex Langevin dynamics," *JHEP* **1410** (2014) 159, arXiv:1407.2090 [hep-lat].

[34] J. Nishimura and S. Shimasaki, "New insights into the problem with a singular drift term in the complex Langevin method," *Phys. Rev. D* **92** (2015) 011501, arXiv:1504.08359 [hep-lat].

[35] S. Tsutsui and T. M. Doi, "An improvement in complex Langevin dynamics from a view point of Lefschetz thimbles," arXiv:1508.04231 [hep-lat].

[36] C. Pehlevan and G. Guralnik, "Complex Langevin Equations and Schwinger-Dyson Equations," *Nucl.Phys.* **B811** (2009) 519–536, arXiv:0710.3756 [hep-th].

[37] G. Guralnik and C. Pehlevan, "Effective Potential for Complex Langevin Equations," *Nucl.Phys.* **B822** (2009) 349–366, arXiv:0902.1503 [hep-lat].

[38] G. Guralnik and Z. Guralnik, "Complexified path integrals and the phases of quantum field theory," *Ann. Phys.* **325** (2010) 2486–2498, arXiv:0710.1256 [hep-th].

[39] Y. Tanizaki and T. Koike, "Real-time Feynman path integral with Picard–Lefschetz theory and its applications to quantum tunneling," *Ann. Phys.* **351** (2014) 250, arXiv:1406.2386 [math-ph].

[40] E. B. Bogomolny, "Calculation of instanton-anti-instanton contributions in quantum mechanics," *Physics Letters B* **91** no. 3–4, (1980) 431 – 435.

[41] J. Zinn-Justin, "Multi-instanton contributions in quantum mechanics," *Nuclear Physics B* **192** no. 1, (1981) 125–140.

[42] G. Basar, G. V. Dunne, and M. Unsal, "Resurgence theory, ghost-instantons, and analytic continuation of path integrals," *JHEP* **1310** (2013) 041, arXiv:1308.1108 [hep-th].

[43] A. Cherman, D. Dorigoni, and M. Unsal, "Decoding perturbation theory using resurgence: Stokes phenomena, new saddle points and Lefschetz thimbles," arXiv:1403.1277 [hep-th].

[44] D. Dorigoni, "An Introduction to Resurgence, Trans-Series and Alien Calculus," arXiv:1411.3585 [hep-th].

[45] A. Behtash, T. Sulejmanpasic, T. Schäfer, and M. Ünsal, "Hidden Topological Angles in Path Integrals," *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **115** no. 4, (2015) 041601, arXiv:1502.06624 [hep-th].

[46] A. Behtash, E. Poppitz, T. Sulejmanpasic, and M. Ünsal, "The curious incident of multi-instantons and the necessity of Lefschetz thimbles," arXiv:1507.04063 [hep-th].

[47] A. Behtash, G. V. Dunne, T. Schaefer, T. Sulejmanpasic, and M. Unsal, "Toward Picard-Lefschetz Theory of Path Integrals, Complex Saddles and Resurgence," arXiv:1510.03435 [hep-th].

[48] H. Fujii, Y. Kikukawa, and T. Sano, *unpublished*.

[49] G. Aarts and F. A. James, "Complex Langevin dynamics in the SU(3) spin model at nonzero chemical potential revisited," *JHEP* **01** (2012) 118, arXiv:1112.4655 [hep-lat].

[50] Y. Tanizaki, Y. Hidaka, and T. Hayata, "Lefschetz-thimble analysis of the sign problem in one-site fermion model," arXiv:1509.07146 [hep-th].

[51] H. Fujii, S. Kamata, and Y. Kikukawa, "Lefschetz thimble structure in one-dimensional lattice Thirring model at finite density," arXiv:1509.08176 [hep-lat].

[52] H. Fujii, S. Kamata, and Y. Kikukawa, "Monte Carlo study of Lefschetz thimble structure in one-dimensional Thirring model at finite density," arXiv:1509.09141 [hep-lat].

[53] A. Alexandru, G. Basar, and P. Bedaque, "A Monte Carlo algorithm for simulating fermions on Lefschetz thimbles," arXiv:1510.03258 [hep-lat].

[54] T. D. Cohen, "Functional integrals for QCD at nonzero chemical potential and zero density," *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **91** (2003) 222001, arXiv:hep-ph/0307089 [hep-ph].

[55] Y. Tanizaki, "Lefschetz-thimble techniques for path integral of zero-dimensional $O(n)$ sigma models," *Phys. Rev. D* **91** (2015) 036002, arXiv:1412.1891 [hep-th].

[56] T. Kanazawa and Y. Tanizaki, "Structure of Lefschetz thimbles in simple fermionic systems," *JHEP* **1503** (2015) 044, arXiv:1412.2802 [hep-th].

[57] D. P. Herzog and J. C. Mattingly, "Noise-Induced Stabilization of Planar Flows I," arXiv:1404.0957 [math.PR].

[58] C. K. Dumlu and G. V. Dunne, "The Stokes Phenomenon and Schwinger Vacuum Pair Production in Time-Dependent Laser Pulses," *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **104** (2010) 250402, arXiv:1004.2509 [hep-th].

[59] C. K. Dumlu and G. V. Dunne, "Interference Effects in Schwinger Vacuum Pair Production for Time-Dependent Laser Pulses," *Phys. Rev. D* **83** (2011) 065028, arXiv:1102.2899 [hep-th].

[60] C. K. Dumlu and G. V. Dunne, "Complex Worldline Instantons and Quantum Interference in Vacuum Pair Production," *Phys. Rev. D* **84** (2011) 125023, arXiv:1110.1657 [hep-th].